



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/083,324

02/26/2002

Anatoliy Panasyuk

2006579-0420 (CTX-079)

4049

69665

7590

03/25/2008

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/083,324	Applicant(s) PANASYUK ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW T. HENNING	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 and 68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 and 68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/26/2007.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 *Response to Arguments*

4 Applicant's arguments filed 12/26/2007 have been fully considered and are not found
5 persuasive.

6 Applicant's argues that cited prior art does not render obvious the claim limitation that
7 the second ticket is disabled from use and is enabled upon validation of the first ticket. The
8 examiner disagrees. It is the service ticket transmitted from the TTP to Server A that reads on
9 the claimed second ticket. This ticket is not "enabled for use" by Server A until it is supplied to
10 Server A. In other words, how can server A use this server ticket if it has not been supplied to
11 server A. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

12 Claims 1-66, and 68 have been examined.

13 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

14 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
16 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

17 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
18 section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
19 such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
20 having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the
21 manner in which the invention was made.

22
23 Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66, and 68 rejected under 35 U.S.C.
24 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication
25 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak, as evidenced by Ganesan (US Patent Number
26 5,557,678).

1 Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content
2 server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority
3 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket)
4 wherein said second ticket is disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045);
5 transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-
6 0043); validating, by said ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and
7 0045-0048); using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a communication session with a
8 content server proxy after said first ticket is validated (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045);
9 enabling, by said ticket authority, said second ticket for use upon said validation of said first
10 ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048); and using, by said content server proxy, said enabled
11 second ticket to establish a communication session with said content server (See Brezak
12 Paragraphs 0045-0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket
13 was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to
14 avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-
15 generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it
16 would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have the TTP pre-generate at
17 least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

18 Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
19 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See
20 Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content
21 server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket
22 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a

1 first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket), wherein said first ticket is transmitted to
2 said client and used to establish a first communication session with said content server proxy
3 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to
4 said content server proxy and used to establish a second communication session with said
5 content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), but failed to disclose generating the
6 second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the
7 time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon
8 request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8
9 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art
10 to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these
11 tickets.

12 Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
13 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority
14 generating a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket) wherein said second ticket is
15 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak
16 Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket
17 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket
18 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and
19 said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said
20 content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said
21 content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
22 0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said

1 first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said
2 enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session with a protocol different from
3 said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045), but failed to disclose
4 generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in
5 the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating
6 data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan
7 Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in
8 the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for
9 these tickets.

10 Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
11 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a first ticket (TGT)
12 and a second ticket (Service Ticket) (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); means for
13 transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-
14 0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a first communication session
15 with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by
16 said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
17 and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content server proxy, said second ticket to
18 establish a second communication session with a content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-
19 0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated.
20 However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor
21 overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for
22 use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been

1 obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service
2 tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

3 Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said
4 ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak
5 Paragraphs 0042-0043).

6 Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority
7 transmits said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said
8 client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

9 Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket
10 to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

11 Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
12 transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second
13 ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
14 0045-0048).

15 Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
16 transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See
17 Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

18 Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority
19 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server
20 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs
21 0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

1 Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first
2 ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
3 and 0044).

4 Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least
5 one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

6 Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits
7 said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority
8 enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

9 Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second
10 ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

11 Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol
12 is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

13 Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication
14 session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
15 communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said
16 content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second
17 communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said client
18 communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said second
19 communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

20 Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session
21 protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
22 communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein

1 said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session
2 protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

3 Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a
4 secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

5
6 Regarding claims 20, 22, 43, and 65, Brezak disclosed a client system including many
7 features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and
8 transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use of a specifically identified server (See
9 Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that the client comprised a web browser or
10 that the server was identified by its address. It was well known in the art at the time of invention
11 that computers had web browsers for accessing web sites. It was further well know in the art at
12 the time of invention that servers were identified by their address. Therefore, it would have been
13 obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the client with
14 a web browser and to identify the target server by its address. This would have been obvious
15 because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply what was well
16 known and common in the art at the time.

17 Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
18 over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US
19 Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

20 Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket
21 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target
22 server to verify the service ticket.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew T Henning/

Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Christopher A. Revak/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131